



Richland County Council
Regular Session
November 17, 2020 – 6:00 PM
Zoom Meeting

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Livingston Chair; Dalhi Myers Vice-Chair; Bill Malinowski, Joyce Dickerson, Yvonne McBride, Allison Terracio, Joe Walker, Gwendolyn Kennedy, Jim Manning and Chakisse Newton

OTHERS PRESENT: Michelle Onley, Leonardo Brown, Tamar Black, Angela Weathersby, Ashiya Myers, John Thompson, Ashley Powell, Brad Farrar, Michael Maloney, James Hayes, Jennifer Wladischkin, Randy Pruitt, Stacey Hamm, Sandra Haynes, Michael Byrd, Jeff Ruble, Clayton Viognier, Larry Smith, Dale Welch, Michael Niermeier, Ronaldo Myers, Tariq Hussain, Bill Davis, Dwight Hanna, Geo Price and Judy Carter

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Livingston called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.
2. **INVOCATION** – The Invocation was led by the Honorable Dalhi Myers.
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – The pledge of Allegiance was led by the Honorable Dalhi Myers.
4. **PRESENTATION** – Mr. Will Schenk made a presentation on behalf of EngenuitySC.
5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. **Special Called Meeting: November 10, 2020** – Ms. Terracio note, due to audio difficulties, her votes on items 17 (e) and 17 (f) were not recorded. She requested the record to reflect she voted in favor on both items.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Mr. Terracio, to approve the minutes as corrected.

In Favor: Malinowski ,Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning

Abstained: Newton

Not Present: Kennedy and Myers

The vote in favor was unanimous, with Ms. Newton abstaining.

6. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA** – Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to adopt the agenda as distributed.

In favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Myers, Newton

Not Present: Kennedy

Opposed: Manning

The vote in favor was unanimous.

**Regular Session
November 17, 2020**

REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION ITEMS

7.

- a. Receipt of Legal Advice: Potential resolution/settlement of contractual/personal matter involving former Administrator Gerald Seals – Mr. Smith stated this was an item the Council deferred two meetings ago. There is no additional information to share with Council. However, if Council has any direction they want to give to us, related to the resolution or settlement of the matter, then we would want to hear that information in Executive Session, address any questions the Council may have and give whatever legal advice is appropriate related to this matter.

Ms. Newton noted she had questions about this item. First, in terms of the settlement we had with Mr. Seals, did that settlement in anyway in preclude a public hearing.

Mr. Smith stated he does not believe the settlement agreement itself directly addressed the question of a public hearing. He believes the agreement was that Mr. Seals would move forward under the terms and conditions of that particular agreement. Of course, the public hearing portion was pending at the time Council and Mr. Seals reached the agreement.

Ms. Newton inquired, given where we are with the previous settlement, is Mr. Seals precluded from additional lawsuits against Richland County.

Mr. Smith advised, if we are going to talk about potential lawsuits, his recommendation would be that we discuss those in Executive Session.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to resolve this matter, that we formally thank Mr. Seals for his service to Richland County and that we acknowledge that his termination process did not follow appropriate protocol, and that resulted in an unfair and negative impact on his career reputation. We give Mr. Seals a public hearing, which will give our citizens full transparency into the matter that happened with the lawsuit and allows Mr. Seals to share any information that would like to share with Council and our citizens. Finally, after that public hearing that we revisit the matter of Mr. Seals' settlement.

Mr. Malinowski stated, in answer to Ms. Newton's question about the settlement and the public hearing, what he saw was that while Mr. Seals reserved his object to termination, and that Council did not comply with State law that he did submit a written request for a public hearing before Council.

Ms. Newton noted she was not here when Mr. Seals was hired, or fired, but she does think that the lack of transparency has been a huge issue in terms of how we deal with it. From her perspective, he has suffered a great harm to his reputation and career simply because he worked for Richland County. Our citizens, at least her constituents, are curious to know what happened, why it happened, and why we used taxpayer dollars to pay a settlement. She would guess that he would be willing to have a public hearing, and this is an opportunity for us to clear the air. It gives us an opportunity to revisit the settlement, so we can move on and put it to bed. She noted when a private business makes employment mistakes, they makes amend with their profit. When the government makes amends, they are doing so with their citizens' dollars; therefore, they should be involved in the process.

Mr. Manning requested Mr. Smith to remind Council of the legal process, with regard to hearings, in terms of the separation, and what State law says about a County Administrator and the County Administrator-Council form of government.

Mr. Smith responded, to the extent that you are asking the lawyers to give you legal advice about the process, and State law, that it needs to be given in Executive Session. If Council wants to waive the attorney-client, we would still have to go into Executive Session, so we can advise you of the potential effects of that. Then, if you wanted to knowingly waive that right, you would have the right to do so.

Mr. Manning stated his question was about the process laid out in State law, and he is not sure that would be an Executive Session item. He was thinking there was a State law, in the Council-Administrator form of government, which addresses if Council wishes to discontinue the County Administrator's contract, the

Administrator's right to request a public hearing and how the process works (i.e. time period, response by Council, etc.)

Mr. Smith responded, in terms of the process, the process calls for the County Administrator to request a hearing, if he so desired. In this case, Mr. Seals did, within the timeframe, request a hearing, which was pending at the time the parties reached a settlement.

Ms. Dickerson stated she thinks we need to have further discussion. Therefore, if it is necessary for us to go into Executive Session to get legal advice, she would support Ms. Newton allowing this to go into Executive Session, and then coming out and voting on the item.

Mr. Livingston made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. McBride, to go into Executive Session to discuss this item.

POINT OF ORDER: Ms. Newton inquired if Mr. Livingston's motion is truly a substitute motion, or because her motion is the one that is currently on the floor.

Mr. Livingston responded it is because Ms. Newton's motion is on the floor.

POINT OF ORDER: Mr. Walker stated he believes Mr. Livingston's explanation to Ms. Newton is incorrect. He believes a substitute motion, presented subsequent to Ms. Newton's motion, if the substitute motion were to pass then hers would be off the table and would not be able to be represented.

Mr. Livingston responded that always happens when a substitute motion passes.

Mr. Walker stated then the explanation given to Ms. Newton was improper.

Mr. Livingston noted he told her it was a substitute motion.

Mr. Walker stated what Mr. Livingston has done is position his substitute motion to take Ms. Newton's motion off the table after Executive Session.

Ms. Newton stated, my understanding is, I have a motion on that was on the floor. There is currently a substitute motion with the intent to go into Executive Session to discuss the original motion she made, as well as any additional information. Following, Executive Session is there anything that would preclude her motion from being addressed at that time.

Mr. Smith responded once we have answered any questions Council has, or explained any legal advice, Council members are free to make any motion that you want, including those already made.

Mr. Walker stated, for clarification, Ms. Newton made a motion. The Chair has made a substitute motion. If the substitute motion were to pass, would Ms. Newton's motion still be properly before us, if presented on the backside of Executive Session.

Mr. Smith responded, once Council comes out of Executive Session, Ms. Newton is not precluded from making the same motion, as her original motion. He does not think there is a situation where whatever motion was made during the public session is going to impede Ms. Newton's ability to make the same motion, once Council comes out of Executive Session. Or, Mr. Livingston, by asking to go into Executive Session, is in anyway going to preclude her from making the same motion she originally made.

Mr. Walker stated, for clarification, the fact that the motion to go into Executive Session has been presented as a substitute motion does not preclude Ms. Newton's original motion from being brought back before us, even if the substitute motion passes.

Mr. Smith responded in the affirmative. Once Council comes out of Executive Session, anybody can make any

motion they want, including a motion that has already been made.

Mr. Malinowski noted, if Ms. Newton withdraws her motion, there will be no question if it was defeated by anything. Then, she can make the motion once Council comes out of Executive Session.

Ms. Newton stated she heard very clearly that she could make her motion again, but for simplicity she will withdraw her motion.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston and Manning

Opposed: Malinowski, Dickerson, Terracio, Walker, Myers and Newton

Not Present: Kennedy

The motion failed.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to formally thank Mr. Seals for his service to Richland County and acknowledge that his termination process did not follow proper procedures and protocols and that resulted in an unfair, negative impact on his career and his reputation. That we give Mr. Seals an opportunity to provide full transparency to our citizens in a public hearing and that following the public hearing we revisit the matter of Mr. Seals' settlement.

Mr. Manning inquired, when we are talking about providing a hearing, we do need to identify that the hearing would be the hearing prescribed by State law, with regard to this process, or would this be some other hearing per Council rules. In addition, where and how would this hearing be conducted?

Mr. Smith responded the hearing would be the one that Mr. Seals was entitled to under State law, and as stated earlier, he had made the request, within the timeframe. The hearing was pending at the time the settlement agreement was reached. If this motion passes, there would have to be a date and time set for Mr. Seals to have that hearing, which would be at the discretion of Council.

Mr. Manning stated, if we are backing up to that point, would that have all aspects of the agreement that was agreed to, and signed off by everybody, null and void and back to the beginning. In order for the hearing to proceed, would we have to bring everything back to where we were in the process at that time?

Mr. Smith responded, because of the Court's action, the Court has voided the agreement. There is no agreement, at this point. That brings us back to where we were before the agreement was reached, which was Mr. Seals had requested a hearing. As I heard Ms. Newton's motion, Mr. Seals' hearing would be set for a certain date and time. After that hearing, according to the motion, Council would address the issues related to any settlement of this matter.

Mr. Manning inquired if the County has retrieved the money from the agreement that is no longer in place.

Mr. Smith responded there has been no exchange of funds.

Mr. Manning inquired as to what Council would have to forego to receive legal advice publicly about the long-term ramifications to the County if we move forward with the motion on the floor.

Mr. Smith responded, they are bound by certain rules of professional responsibility, in terms of what lawyers can and cannot do. One of the things is, we cannot break attorney-client privilege. Only Council has the authority to decide that they want to waive, or break, attorney-client privilege. However, before Council did that, we have a responsibility to tell you the potential ramifications of your waiving attorney-client privilege. In order to tell Council that, that would be in the form of legal advice, and would require us to go into Executive Session. Then, if Council wanted to out and say, "We have been told, and in spite of being told we are going to waive, or break, attorney-client privilege," that would be up to Council.

Mr. Manning stated, for clarification, because we have not gone into Executive Session, we cannot get legal advice, related to this motion.

Mr. Smith responded in the affirmative.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, by law, Mr. Seals could have requested a hearing, but he is not mandated to have a hearing.

Mr. Smith responded the law gives Mr. Seals the right to have a hearing, and it is his right to exercise that opportunity or not.

Ms. McBride noted, based on the motion before us, Mr. Seals does not have to accept having a hearing.

Mr. Smith stated, it is his understanding, it is in the form of an offer. Mr. Seals can either accept or reject that offer, or come back with a counteroffer.

Ms. McBride inquired, if Mr. Seals rejects the offer, where would we be in the process.

Mr. Smith responded we would still be where we are right now with us having to figure out a resolution to this matter.

Ms. McBride stated what we are trying to do now is to determine, working with Mr. Seals, whether he wants a hearing of the procedures we need to take. This is just another almost unnecessary step that we are trying to resolve now.

Mr. Smith responded, in terms of the steps we are taking, at this point, he thinks what we were trying to do, with Council, is get some direction from Council about what type of offer you all want us to take back to Mr. Seals. There's a motion, which presumably does that. Of course, until such time that we take the offer to him, we do not know how that offer will be received or not received by Mr. Seals, or where that will leave us.

Ms. McBride noted she was thinking Legal was already developing a process in working with Mr. Seals to bring back to Council.

Mr. Smith stated, what they reported last time, was that Mr. Seals and his attorney agreed they would join us on the motion with the Court to reconsider. However, in terms of any other information coming from them, regarding this matter, there was no additional information.

Ms. McBride inquired, in terms of our attorneys' work with Mr. Seals, is that null and void, if the motion on the floor passes?

Mr. Smith responded "No." The motion, regarding the reconsideration has already been filed. We are waiting on a response from the judge.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, Terracio, Walker, Kennedy, Myers and Newton

Opposed: Livingston

Abstain: McBride and Manning

The vote was in favor.

Mr. Walker moved, seconded by Mr. Malinowski, to reconsider this item.

In Favor: McBride, Livingston, Kennedy and Manning

**Regular Session
November 17, 2020**

Opposed: Malinowski , Dickerson, Terracio, Walker, Myers and Newton

The motion for reconsideration failed.

8. **CITIZENS' INPUT**

- a. For Items on the Agenda Not Requiring a Public Hearing – No comments were received.

9. **CITIZENS' INPUT**

- a. Must Pertain to Richland County Matter Not on the Agenda (Items for which a public hearing is required or a public hearing has been scheduled cannot be addressed at this time) – No comments were received.

10. **REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

- a. Coronavirus Update – Mr. Brown stated the percent positive for Richland County is approximately 17.1%. The percent positive had been going down, but there has been a spike in cases in the last few weeks. He noted that approximately 7% of the cases are requiring a hospital stay, and there have been 282 deaths that are COVID-related. The County has participated in several mask giveaways. There are currently mask giveaways scheduled on November 20 in District 10 at Temple of Faith Bible Way Church, and in District 11 at Crossroads Community Center. On December 4, in District 10, there is a mask giveaway at Mt. Moriah Baptist Church. Then, on December 11, in District 11, there is a mask giveaway at the Richland County Sheriff's Region I Substation.

In response to a question raised at the last Council meeting, 85 – 87% of Administration employees are working primarily onsite; 13 – 15% are primarily tele-working and 2% are working an alternative/flex schedule.

Mr. Brown stated, in preparation for limited in-person services, safety, cleaning, build access, and workplace protocols have been addressed. The CDC's Resuming Business Toolkit will be utilized to assess the County's readiness to allow in-person services. In addition, we have acquired appointment software, which will allow us to have limited in-person services. There will be face masks available for employees and the public. The County has acquired handheld infrared thermometers and temperature scanning devices have been installed. Supervisory training has been provided, and will continue training, as necessary, to impact the slow speed of COVID-19. Also, the Human Resources Department has offered mental wellness sessions.

PRISMA Health has expressed a desire to continue to utilize the Sears facility.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – Ms. Myers noted the fiber optic cable is being installed in District 10, so this time next year more people in Richland County will have access to in the internet.

Ms. Newton inquired if there is any additional information regarding CARES funding, or other funding, to offset the costs associated with the County's COVID response.

Mr. Brown responded the State has communicated the request the County submitted, through the CARES Act Program, has been approved. Once the County receives those funds, he will inform Council of the amount reimbursed.

Ms. McBride requested clarification on the makeup of the 85% of employees that are currently working onsite.

Mr. Brown stated those are Administration direct report employees. He does not have the details of the breakdown of the elected and appointed officials' employees, but believes they are working similarly to what Administration is doing.

11. **REPORT OF THE CLERK OF COUNCIL** – No report was given.

12. **REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – No report was given.

13. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS**

- a. 20-029MA, Dave R. Brock, M-1/RM-MD to LI (2 Acres), 1804 Shop Road, TMS # 13604-01-01 [THIRD READING]

Mr. Manning moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to approve the consent item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Myers and Newton

Not Present: Kennedy

The vote in favor was unanimous.

14. **THIRD READING**

- a. 20-021MA, Erica Serbin, RM-MD to MH (2.34 Acres), 8534 Old Percival Road, TMS # R22602-02-07 – Ms. Myers inquired if the ownership of this property was connected to the trailer parker demolition the County undertook.

Mr. Voignier responded there is not a connection.

Ms. Myers moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker Myers and Newton

Not Present: Kennedy

The vote in favor was unanimous.

15. **SECOND READING**

- a. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and Project Offer to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; and other related matters – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Manning, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Myers and Newton

Not Present: Kennedy

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem and infrastructure credit agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and Project Yeti to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker and Newton

Not Present: Kennedy

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- c. Authorizing the expansion of the boundaries of the I-77 Corridor Regional Industrial Park jointly developed with Fairfield County to include certain property located in Richland County; the execution and delivery of an infrastructure credit agreement to provide for infrastructure credits to Gable Oaks Housing Associates LP; and

other related matters – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to approve this item.

Ms. McBride reiterated that she is moving for approval based on her conversation with the President of the Gable Oaks Association, City Councilmen and the lawyers’ briefing during the Economic Development Committee.

Mr. Livingston stated anytime we are doing a FILOT the industrial park will be attached to it.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker and Newton

Not Present: Kennedy

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- d. Approving the transfer of certain real property located in Richland County, the granting of certain options and other matters related thereto – Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve this item.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker and Newton

Not Present: Kennedy

The vote in favor was unanimous.

16. REPORT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

- a. Committing to negotiate a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes agreement between Richland County and Project Cross; identifying the project; and other matters related thereto – Mr. Livingston stated the committee recommended approval of this item.

In Favor: Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

Not Present: Kennedy

The vote was in favor.

- b. Authorizing the execution and delivery of a fee-in-lieu of ad valorem taxes and incentive agreement by and between Richland County, South Carolina and Project Cross to provide for payment of a fee-in-lieu of taxes; authorizing certain infrastructure credits; and other related matters [FIRST READING] – Mr. Livingston stated the committee recommended approval of this item.

In Favor: Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

Not Present: Kennedy

The vote was in favor.

17. REPORT OF THE RULES AND APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

I. NOTIFICATION OF APPOINTMENTS

- a. Airport Commission – 2 – Mr. Malinowski stated the committee recommended re-appointing Mr. John

Parrish and appointing Mr. Prentiss McLaurin.

Ms. McBride inquired about how long Mr. Parrish has served on the Airport Commission.

Mr. Malinowski responded this would be his 2nd term.

Ms. McBride inquired if there are term limitations on any of the committees.

Mr. Malinowski responded some of the committee do have term limitations, but he is not sure which ones. He noted Ms. Onley could provide that information.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning and Newton

Not Present: Kennedy

The vote in favor was unanimous.

18. **REPORT OF THE RENAISSANCE AD HOC COMMITTEE**

- a. I move to direct staff, by way of the County Administrator, to continue in its development of a proposal for the beautification of the Old Antique Mall site as an expansion of the Broad River Road Corridor Façade Grant Program. This beautification effort is intended to be an intermediary improvement until such a time that the highest and best use for the site is determined via community engagement as part of the Richland Renaissance Initiative. Staff should also work in concert with Richland County Sheriff's Department and County Magistrate's Office to provide a comprehensive proposal for Council consideration [DICKERSON] – Ms. Dickerson stated the committee recommended to direct staff to determine if the location will be a priority in 2021 Capital Improvement budget.

Ms. Newton stated one of the things the Magistrate's Office was going to do was to come back and ranked all of their priorities and plans for their offices. She offered a friendly amendment that when they come back with their plan that they list all of their priorities for Magistrate's Office for the Capital Improvement Plan.

Mr. Malinowski stated, for clarification, in the Capital Improvement budget there are already funds set aside for the Magistrate's Office. Therefore, the motion is to utilize the funds, and allow the Magistrate to come forward with whether or not this building would be one of their priorities.

Mr. Walker stated the Magistrate and the Sheriff's Department are seeking to have this item deferred. He inquired if there is a reason this could not be deferred for one meeting.

Ms. Dickerson responded we have gone through several documents with the Sheriff's Department and the Magistrate's Office. Therefore, she thinks it would be okay for the Magistrate to make his presentation when it comes up, but that it should go forward so it can be on the list of ones to be considered.

Mr. Walker inquired if it would be appropriate to hear from the Sheriff's Department, as they will be the intended user.

Ms. Terracio inquired about what the \$6.9M represents.

Mr. Brown responded the \$6.9M is referencing the Dutch Fork Magistrate Facility and Region Four Office. He is not sure of the specifics of those amounts, and would need to be provided by the Chief Magistrate and/or Chief Cowan.

Chief Cowan stated the Chief Magistrate has a lot of information that is not ready to be presented. One of the biggest thing was the priorities for the Magistrate's Office and co-locating with the Sheriff's Department. Additionally, identifying the costs and where the locations would be. As far as the Dutch Fork Magistrate Office

is concerned, their position is the first thing that needs to take place is the demolition of the Old Antique Mall. The Chief Magistrate wants the Magistrate's Office there, but there are so many unanswered questions.

Ms. Dickerson moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to defer this item.

In Favor: Malinowski and Walker

Opposed: Dickerson, McBride, Livingston Terracio, Kennedy, Manning and Newton

Not Present: Myers

The motion for deferral failed.

Ms. Newton stated what she understood Chief Cowan to say was that the Sheriff's Office and the Magistrate wanted to come back with full information to present their recommendations on how they wanted to move forward. The way she understands the motion on the floor is requesting staff to do exactly that. It seems the motion is in concert with what Judge Edmond and the Sheriff's Department is asking for.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Kennedy, Manning and Newton

Opposed: Walker

Not Present: Myers

The vote was in favor.

- b. I move that Richland County build a new County Courthouse [MANNING] – Ms. Dickerson stated the committee recommended moving forward to address building a new County Courthouse.

Mr. Malinowski stated his recollection is that we used to have a Courthouse Ad Hoc Committee. He inquired what happened to the committee, and why this would not be handled through that committee.

Ms. Dickerson responded there was a Courthouse Ad Hoc Committee. The committee was dissolved.

Mr. Malinowski further stated he thought the Courthouse was a part of the Renaissance Plan. He inquired where the results are from when it was previously discussed.

Mr. Walker stated, given the fact this motion has been routed through the Renaissance Ad Hoc Committee, implies it is part of the Renaissance Program. A "No" vote to this unilateral motion, which extracts one component of the Renaissance Program, would not necessarily halt the progress and consideration being made as it pertains to the Courthouse within the Renaissance Program.

Mr. Livingston responded that is correct.

Ms. Newton stated she was not here during the initial process for the Courthouse, so she is unclear on what the whole process would look like, when it comes to the Courthouse. The recommendation she made, at the committee, is that we direct staff to look at the Renaissance Program, or the previous items that were included in it, comprehensively, so that we can see where they fit in.

Ms. Newton moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to direct staff to comprehensively look at the Renaissance Program, or the previous items that were included in it, in order to determine where they fit in.

Ms. McBride stated it is somewhat of a misnomer, in terms of the Renaissance Committee, because we deferred it, and then we brought back up the Renaissance. There are several different components to the Renaissance Committee. We are addressing the administrative components now. She agrees there is confusion, particularly

for those that are new. To start all over, would have wasted a lot of time. There are certain components that need to be moved on immediately. We could separate the components. Each one of them is very comprehensive, so lumping them all back together would be too much, and would not be intent when it was deferred. She suggested reviewing the Courthouse part and having staff bring back with recommendations to the committee.

POINT OF ORDER – Ms. Myers stated she would be concerned with putting this item back in committee, or remanding it anywhere else because Council voted a year ago to have staff to bring us a comprehensive Renaissance Plan. At this point, we have buildings falling down, and we need to move forward.

Ms. McBride stated, for clarification, we already have a plan in place.

Ms. Myers responded she does not understand that we do. The point of her motion, which will be taken up in the D&S Committee, was there was no visibility as to what was happening with Renaissance.

Ms. McBride stated we did have a plan for the Courthouse. Her motion was to deal with what we have and to complete it for the Courthouse.

Ms. Terracio offered a friendly amendment to include a rebranding of what has been known as the “Renaissance”. Every time we say the word it reinforces an unknown tumbleweed of programs and projects.

Ms. Newton stated, for clarification, when she says a comprehensive plan it does not mean we are going to do all of these things together simultaneously. We are talking about multiple priorities that have long processes to figure out how we are going to do them. There are cost, budget and strategy implications. She understood in the previous vision for the Courthouse there were dependent variables about what that would mean for 2020 Hampton Street.

Mr. Livingston stated since the Renaissance Plan started the County’s needs have changed. He would recommend asking staff what the County’s current facilities needs are, and have them bring back a utilization plan for those facilities. We can say the plan must include DSS, 911, Public Safety, etc., but staff will prioritize these things.

Mr. Livingston made a second substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to direct staff to review the current County facility needs and County-owned properties, and bring back a utilization plan for Council’s consideration. The plan will prioritize DSS, Public Safety and the Courthouse.

Mr. Walker suggested making the motion pertinent to this item and the following item.

Ms. Newton requested Mr. Livingston to clarify what he mean by “utilization plan”.

Mr. Livingston responded what would be the best utilization for the facilities.

Mr. Malinowski stated it seems, if we want to do the best thing for the County, staff needs to come up with a prioritization list.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning and Newton

Opposed: Myers

Not Present: Kennedy

The vote was in favor.

- c. I move that Richland County provide a facility for the Richland County DSS – This item was included in the previous motion.

19. **OTHER ITEMS**

- a. **Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center – Detainee Telephone Service** – Ms. Wladischkin noted, during the RFP process for the Inmate Telephone System, one of the evaluation factor outlined was the commission structure. The submittals were rated based on that commission structure, and the most favorable commission structure for the County would have received the most points. In Council' desire to eliminate that commission structure, and move forward with charging the inmates the cost, it voids the commission rating in the RFP. She is suggesting that we go to all of the submittals and ask for their best and final offers, based on Council's desire for the cost structure, and eliminating the commission to the County.

Ms. McBride stated this item came straight to Council and not through the Detention Center Ad Hoc Committee. There are a lot of other options we may want to look at, in terms of the money that the County is getting as a result of the telephone usage. We have a real problem with mental health, drug and substance abuse, in our facility. There may be a way for us to redirect those funds to address those issues. If this is not time sensitive we need to study this to make sure we are providing a prototype program for the detainees, and we are getting the best results for this contract.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Dickerson, to refer this item to the Detention Ad Hoc Committee.

In Favor: Malinowski, Dickerson, McBride, Livingston, Terracio, Walker, Manning, Myers and Newton

Not Present: Kennedy

The vote in favor was unanimous.

20. **EXECUTIVE SESSION** – There were no items for Executive Session.
21. **MOTION PERIOD** – There were no motions.
22. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:30 PM.